

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-9, and 11-15 are pending after the amendment. Claims 2-4, 10, and 16-21 are cancelled.

The independent Claim 1 has been amended to be directed to the OLED being configured and programmed to substitute for the static painted display glass in prior art electronic slot machines. By installing the OLED over the outer housing of a conventional slot machine, such as over the prior art display glass, the slot machine itself may be reprogrammed to play a different video slot game, and the OLED may be programmed to statically display the identity of the changed game without requiring any display glass to be replaced. Therefore, the upgrade to a new game may be performed essentially for free, and even remotely, with no physical changes to the machine itself. This is pointed out on page 8, last two paragraphs, which read,

In another embodiment, any portion of the top display glass 14, 15 or the bottom display glass 16, or any combination of them, may be OLED displays that can be controlled to display any image. As such, the display glass does not need to be replaced if the machine is configured to play a different game. Control of OLEDs is well known. The image displayed can be static to display information for a particular game or may change depending on the status of the game being played. For example, the display glass may have an attract mode, a play mode, and a celebration mode for a player win. The display glass may also be a LCD or any other type of programmable display.

Recently, flat panel displays with pixels that hold their on or off states even after power has been removed have become commercially available. Therefore, the programmable display glass may be programmed to display anything without further processing by the gaming machine's microcomputer until it is time to change the display. Such a display is sometimes referred to as electronic paper. Reconfiguring the gaming machine for a new game would require a one time reprogramming of the display glass. This display glass in combination with the OLED reels and other inventions described herein enable a gaming machine owner to change the game played and the appearance of the gaming machine with only a software change for the displays and a game program change. This reconfiguration may be done remotely via a server or performed at the gaming machine.

OLED displays may be flat like paper and readily substitute for the printed display glass without using up any space internal to the slot machine. For a static display, as claimed, the OLED need only be programmed once, and the gaming machine's main processor does not need to be programmed to control the OLED. This is an important advantage for retrofitting slot machines with new games, since the game program that controls the game display need not include the programming for the OLED.

The invention is particularly applicable to retrofitting outdated slot machines having a painted display glass, since the thin OLED can just be affixed over the display glass and programmed to display the reprogrammed game.

Independent method Claim 12 has been similarly amended but does not require the OLED to be on the outer surface of the gaming device. Claim 12 recites that the game and OLED are remotely programmed.

#### **Rejection Under 35 USC 112, First and Second Paragraphs**

The examiner rejected Claims 1, 11, 12, and 17 since the term "identify" was not mentioned in the specification. Claim 11 in the filed application included the language: "wherein the OLED display is controlled to display an identity of the main game to the player." Original Claim 17 had similar language. Such claim language forms part of the disclosure. This original language in the context of pages 8-9 of the specification, quoted above, makes it clear that the OLED would be programmed to convey to the player the manufacturer's given title (identity) of the main game (usually trademarked by the manufacturer), just as a prior art display glass would display the identity of the game. This would be the understanding of those skilled in the art reading the application. The specification has been amended to incorporate verbatim the language of original Claim 11.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 USC 112 rejection has been overcome.

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103**

The examiner rejected Claims 1-10 as being obvious over Loose patent 6,517,433 in combination with Loose publication 2003/0157980.

Loose '433 is directed to superimposing an image over mechanical reels, such as by using an angled glass plate and a CRT 14b (Fig. 2b) or a flat panel transmissive LCD display (Fig. 2a, col. 2, lines 41-46). In another embodiment, Loose describes that the LCD screen over the reels may additionally display a bonus game (col. 5, lines 43-51). An opaque shade may be brought down behind the LCD to block out the reels (col. 5, lines 40-51). Loose '433 also shows a secondary display 40 in Fig. 1 that displays a bonus game (col. 4, lines 51-57).

The Loose publication 2003/0157980 was cited for its mentioning of using an OLED display on a reel instead of an LCD or other type of display.

In the December 10, 2007 office action, pages 5-6, the examiner took the position that it is a matter of design choice what to display on any display and to position the display in any location.

However, Claim 1 is directed to essentially substituting a thin OLED for the prior art painted display glass to allow the game played by the gaming machine to be electronically changed with no physical modification to the machine. Since the OLED is placed on the "outer housing of the gaming machine," it may be used to retrofit out-of-date slot machines. The OLED presents a static display so that it need only be reprogrammed once without requiring any dynamic control by the gaming machine's processor. Accordingly, the OLED does not need support from the main processor once it is programmed. Therefore, the claimed features of the OLED that distinguish it from the combination of Loose '433 and '980 and bring about the above advantages are very significant and not simply a matter of design choice.

Accordingly, Applicant's independent Claim 1 and dependent claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the combination of references.

Independent method Claim 12 is similar to Claim 1 in many respects. The examiner combined the Loose references with Fennell (US Pat. 5,695,400) to reject Claims 11-17. The examiner cited Fennell for remote transmission of games. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is allowable for the same reasons given for the allowance of Claim 1, where the main invention lies in the OLED substituting for the prior art display glass so that the machine can be upgraded with new games without physically changing the machine.

Therefore, all claims have been shown to be patentable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please telephone the undersigned at (408) 382-0480 ex. 202, if there are any questions or the examiner believes the claims need to be clarified.

Certificate of Electronic Transmission  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted  
electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office using EFS-Web on the date shown below.

/Brian D Ogonowsky/  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

March 10, 2008  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian D Ogonowsky/

Brian D. Ogonowsky  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 31,988  
Patent Law Group LLP  
2635 N. First St.  
Suite 223  
San Jose, CA 95134  
Tel (408) 382-0480 x202  
Fax (408) 382-0481